



**NH 111 Corridor & Wall Street Extension Feasibility Study  
Project Advisory Meeting  
Windham Planning & Development Office  
Minutes**

January 19, 2010

**Members Present:** Bruce Breton, David Sullivan, Gerry Lewis, Tom McPherson, Annette Stoller, Sy Wrenn, Kay Normington, Bob Winmill, and Matt Caron.

**Project Staff Present:** Gene McCarthy and Mike McDonald (McFarland-Johnson); Cliff Sinnott; and Laura Scott, (Windham).

**Others Present:** Ruth Ellen Post, Planning Board; Dianna Fallon, Resident.

**1. Open/Welcome/Introductions**

**Sinnott** welcomed everyone and attendees introduced themselves and stated what organization they represented.

**2. Public Comment; Other Communication**

None; Sinnott noted there would be another opportunity for public comment at the end of the meeting

**3. PAC meeting #2 Summary**

**Motion:** **Stoller** made a motion to approve the PAC meeting #2 summary. **Motion** seconded. **Motion carried.**

**4. Review/discussion of Draft Problem & Vision Statements**

**McCarthy** stated the two statements are the foundation of where the committee goes with the project. It establishes why the committee exists and the statements will be the committees. The statements were crafted by Meg Walker, the consultant who attended the public meeting. **McCarthy** asked members for their opinions about the statements.

**Problem statement comments:**

**Chief Lewis** commented that there is a need to include something about limited access roads; **McCarthy** asked if there is too much traffic going through town or is speed an issue; several members commented that better access management was needed, including limited access form NH111, supplemented with internal access from one lot to the next (i.e. connected parking lots or service roads. **Sinnott** noted that much of the discussion at the public meeting about the

town center “bypass” was about business owners’ concern about losing their exposure to a high volume of traffic that currently exists; **Lewis**, and others stated their belief that many residents are even now deterred from shopping at local businesses because of traffic volumes and congestion, and that will get worse with the expansion of I-93. **Scott** stated she thinks problem statement #2 captures the sentiments of the town, but does not necessarily agree with the wording ‘walkable’, and that the word ‘vibrant’ will capture walkability and other aspects of the town center the Town is striving for; **Bruce Breton** agreed that statement #2 is the most thorough, it starts off with the goal and drives into the issues, some wording could fit into the statement that deals with access management and the high volume of traffic; the goal is to allow the businesses to succeed, flourish and be profitable, in order to do that the volume of traffic needs to remain.

**McCarthy** indicated that the problem statement goal should say what isn’t working now and the vision statement should focus how to achieve what the community sees as the future of the Town of Windham. Several members suggested that there needs a balance between moving traffic and providing access. **Lewis** suggested that an access road behind the current shopping plazas connecting them all together, would help move traffic on the main road because those cars would not be entering existing driveways.

The question was asked, will the old Route 111, when exit 3 is finished, serve the above purpose? **Sinnott** stated that was the concept when it was decided to relocate 111 north, however it only extends from I-93 to the Wall St. intersection, and not west from there. From a safety standpoint and traffic calming, it would help if the parking lots were connected.

**McCarthy** asked how to state the above comments into a problem? How to get around 111, there are no secondary roads, how should it be stated. **Chief McPherson** stated in order to access any of the businesses, every car has to get back onto 111. **McCarthy** stated there needs to be more information in the problem statement about 111, not just the town center. **Sinnott** stated that 111 is being asked to serve two conflicting purposes: to be both a major east/west highway and to be an access road for local businesses.

**Stoller** suggested saying that 111 has no current alternative mode of access for local businesses. **McCarthy** stated he would like to use access management as the solution in the vision statement. Suggested words for the problem statement included: inadequate, inappropriate, unbalanced, single access, and/or lacks connectivity.

**Sy Wrenn** stated he also likes statement #2 and suggested with some changes it would work. He suggested adding the following language to the 2<sup>nd</sup> question: with the high volume of through traffic on the state road, which is likely to increase, coupled with lack of interconnectivity with businesses. Members want traffic that is not stopping in Windham to just go through without impacting local traffic.

Discussion ensued about trucks diverting through Town to avoid the weigh station on I-93 when it is active.

**McCarthy** stated he will revise the problem statement, circulate it before the next meeting and then have more discussion at the next meeting.

**Vision statement comments:**

**Scott** stated she would like some mention of alternative transportation routes to be included in the statement. Other items to be included should be: a vibrant village center; mixed commercial, retail, residential opportunities; and community spaces. Also, require all new developments to have interconnectivity to address the earlier access management discussion. Discussion ensued about how to influence current business to accept interconnectivity. It was suggested to include access adjacent open space areas. More discussion ensued about vision statement #1.

**McCarthy** stated he will revise the vision statement, circulate it before the next meeting and then have more discussion at the next meeting. Further comments on either the Problem or Vision statement sent to him via email will be welcomed. He will review comments and drafts with Meg from PPS.

#### **5. Project Task updates**

**Sinnott** indicated this item will be handled through the course of discussion the traffic modeling and other items

#### **6. Initial Traffic Modeling Results**

**McCarthy** distributed a handout showing projected traffic volumes, counts and modeling results for 2035, including different version for different scenarios. He spoke about the traffic counts and reviewed the work that has been completed. He cautioned that results that may seem counter-intuitive at first often have a logical explanation when you consider regional effects of changes in access. Discussion ensued amongst members about traffic patterns in the area.

**Sinnott** stated that Brian Grady from from RSG will attend the next meeting to explain the model, assumption made and respond to questions.

#### **7. Review Discussion: Future Land Use & Development Assumptions (for Modeling)**

**Sinnott** indicated that on very important consideration for making traffic projects is to have reasonable forecasts of where future growth is likely to occur, how much there will be and of what type. A good source for this is the current future land use section of the Master Plan. In addition to that, it is important to consider known major development that is proposed, and any significant changes in zoning that are expected. More discussion ensued about how the area will change in the future. **Sullivan** noted that that the NHDOT will not be building the new Exit 3 Park and Ride where originally planned. The new location has not been determined.

#### **8. Project Schedule update; proposed calendar**

**Sinnott** said an updated calendar had not been prepared and asked that this itme be deferred.

#### **9. Project Website - Status**

**Scott** said that she will need help pulling together past materials in electronic from to post on the website. **Dave Sullivan** provided the contact in the Town Hall for creating a Wall St. project page and for posting materials. **McCarthy** and MJ will assist with this.

#### **10. Project Administration**

a. Contract Extension request

**Sinnott** believes the contract extension was approved at the most recent G&C meeting and will verify that with NHDOT staff.

b. Tracking/submission of Committee members – hours to date

**Sinnott** reiterated how important it is that Committee members keep track of their time spent on the project – both Town employees and committee volunteers. This in-kind time will be used to fulfill half of the project match requirement. **Scott** asked that members send her the hours spent so far. **McCarthy** said hours should include not only meeting time but time spent reading materials and preparing for the meeting.

**11. Other Business**

**Public Comment:** **Dianna Fallon** asked if she could submit comments or thoughts on the problem and vision statements; **McCarthy** said they would be welcome and should be submitted to him.

**12. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:10

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne M. Rines (via meeting recording)  
Recording Secretary